

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/847,035	04/30/2001	Brian T. Murren	GE1-009US	5206
21718 LEE & HAYES	7590 01/02/2008 S.P.I. C		EXAM	INER
SUITE 500			ELISCA, PIERRE E	
421 W RIVERSIDE SPOKANE, WA 99201			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
01 010 11 12, 11	11 77201		3621	,
· .			· ·	
·			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/02/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

lhpto@leehayes.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/847,035	MURREN ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Pierre E. Elisca	3621
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from to cause the application to become ABANDONEI	ely filed the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>05 Oct</u> 2a)□ This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This 3)□ Since this application is in condition for allowan closed in accordance with the practice under Expression is the practice of th	action is non-final. ce except for formal matters, pro	
Disposition of Claims		
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-6,8,12-19,38,39,42-46,49 and 50 is/a 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) 9,10,40 and 41 is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner	n from consideration.	
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acceed applicant may not request that any objection to the description and the correction are considered as a second and the correction are considered as a second ar	frawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obju	37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	•	
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign and All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of 	have been received. have been received in Application ity documents have been receive (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No d in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary (Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:	te

09/847,035 Art Unit: 3621

Page 2

DETAILED ACTION

- 1. This office action is in response to Applicant's amendment filed on 10/05/2007.
- 2. Claims 1-6, 8-10, 12-19, 38-46, and 49-50 are pending.
- 3. The rejection to claims 1-6, 8, 12-19, 38-39, 42-46 and 49 under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Bowman 253" and Garg 846" as set forth in the Office action mailed on 04/09/2007 is maintained.

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 9, 10, 40 and 41 are allowed over the prior art of record.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 6. Claims 1-6, 8, 12-19, 38, 39, 42-46 and 49-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Bowman-Anuah (U.S. Pat. No. 6,615,253) in view of the newly found prior art Novik et al (U.S. Pat. No. 6,275,957).

09/847,035

Art Unit: 3621

Bowman substantially discloses publishing information to the various users using push technology prior to the user requesting the content. In particular Bowman pushes a large set of content (including the content in which the user wants to receive) and then limiting or selecting a subset of that content based upon the particular user's desires. In this particular rejection, the Examiner interprets the various "components" as corresponding memory locations within a computer without software. In other words, each memory address or group of addresses is a "component". However Bowman does not explicitly disclose the limitations of "a subscriber request component (or event-filtering component) for modifying and identifying subscribers". Novik discloses an event-filtering component for modifying and identifying subscribers. The event-filtering component can expose standardized interface to the event providers that report events and to the subscriber software to which events are reported (see., Novik, col 1, lines 48-67, col 4, lines 5-60, figs 1-3).

However it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bowman to include the limitation detailed above as taught by Novik because such a modification would have segregated the parts of the system which would help make debugging easier.

7. Claims 1-6, 8, 12-19, 38, 39, 42-46 and 49-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103
(a) as being unpatentable over Garg et al (U.S. Pat. No. 6,567,846) in view of the newly found prior art Novik et al (U.S. Pat. No. 6,275,957).

Application/Control Number:

09/847,035

Art Unit: 3621

Garg substantially discloses the claimed invention including publishing information to the various users using push technology prior to the user requesting the content. In particular Bowman pushes a large set of content (including the content in which the user wants to receive) and then limiting or selecting a subset of that content based upon the particular user's desires. In this particular rejection, the Examiner interprets the various "components" as corresponding memory locations within a computer without software. In other words, each memory address or group of addresses is a "component". However Garg does not explicitly disclose the limitations of "a subscriber request component (or event-filtering component) for modifying and identifying subscribers. Novik discloses an event-filtering component for modifying and identifying subscribers. The event-filtering component can expose standardized interface to the event providers that report events and to the subscriber software to which events are reported (see., Novik, col 1, lines 48-67, col 4, lines 5-60, figs 1-3).

However it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Garg to include the limitation detailed above as taught by Novik because such a modification would have segregated the parts of the system which would help make debugging easier.

However it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Garg to include labeling each sections "components". Such a modification would have segregated the parts of the system which would help make debugging easier.

Application/Control Number:

09/847,035 Art Unit: 3621

RESPONSE TO ARGUMENTS

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-6, 8, 12-19, 38, 39, 42-46 and 49-8. 50 have been fully considered but they are moot in view of new ground (s) of rejection.

Conclusion

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Pierre E. Elisca whose telephone number is 571 272 6706. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30 to 5:00. Patents and hoteling.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Fischer can be reached on 571 272 6779. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

> PRIMARY EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600